

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING	DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,916	09/22/2003		Koichiro Tanaka	0756-7197 5108	
31780 7	590	03/17/2006	EXAMINER		
ERIC ROBIN	ISON		KUNEMUND, ROBERT M		
PMB 955 21010 SOUTHBANK ST.				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
POTOMAC FA	ALLS, VA	20165		1722	<u>-</u>

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/664,916	TANAKA, KOICHIRO					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Robert M. Kunemund	1722					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 Ja	nuary 2006.						
· <u>—</u>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-54</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-54</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.					
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	atom Application (1-10-102)					

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 to 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (6,393,042) in view of Okamoto et al (EP 1,063,049).

The Tanaka reference teaches a method and apparatus for laser scanning amorphous semiconducting material, note entire reference. The laser scanner comprises a laser source such a YAG or Ar laser. The beam travels through a homogenizer to create a linear bean, note figure 1. The bean then hits the amorphous materials, which is on a movable stage. The laser can be an eximer laser. The beam crystallizes the amorphous material such as silicon, note examples. The sole difference between the instant claims and the prior art is the reflective surfaces facing each other. However, the Okamoto et al reference teaches a laser scanning apparatus and method where the beam is treated by passing through two facing reflective surfaces, note pages 5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Tanaka reference by the teachings of the Okamoto et al reference to use the reflective surfaces in order to increase the performance of the laser decreasing scanning times.

Art Unit: 1722

Claims 5 to 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (6,393,042) in view of Okamoto et al (EP 1,063,049) and Yamazaki et al (6,437,313).

The Tanaka and Okamoto et al references are relied on for the same reasons as stated, supra, and differ from the instant claims in the cylindrical lens. However, the Yamazaki et al reference teaches an apparatus and method for laser scanning an amorphous material where the beam travels through a cylindrical lens while being treated prior to scanning the material, note col. 5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Tanaka and Okamoto et al references by the teachings of the Yamazaki et al reference to use a cylindrical lens in order to optimumize the laser shape and intensity.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed January 6, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' argument concerning the beam homogenizer is noted. However, the Tanaka et al reference in the examples merely teaches a beam homogenizer for a linearly shaped laser beam. There is no limitation as to what is being smooth or shaped. The reference does teach also a line beam as is now claimed.

The combination of references does in fact teach the entirely claimed invention as set forth in the above rejections.

Art Unit: 1722

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M. Kunemund whose telephone number is 571-272-1464. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on 571-272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RMK

ROBERT KUNEMUND PRIMARY EXAMINER